

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 11-27, and 29-31, as amended, are pending in this application. In this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 30 to clarify that one embodiment of the present invention includes classifying the results of the determining into at least three categories. In addition, claims 1 and 30 have been amended to clarify that some of the unique registration numbers are not linked.

In light of the Office Action, Applicants believe these amendments serve a useful clarification purpose, and are desirable for clarification purposes, independent of patentability. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim amendments do not limit the range of any permissible equivalents. As no new matter has been added by the amendments herein, Applicants respectfully request entry of these amendments at this time.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

At pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11-27, 29 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that the process recited therein is computer implemented, and such recitations have been included as part of the body of the claim as suggested by the Examiner. In light of the amendment, Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection has been overcome. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11-27, and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the recitation "where some of the unique registration numbers are not linked" is not disclosed in the specification. This assertion, however, is unsupported.

Specifically, the present application specifically states that, in one aspect, a particular product may have multiple registry entries and registration numbers associated therewith. Written Description at Page 6, lines 9-10. Those entries may be linked. *Id.* at Page 6, lines 10-11. A skilled artisan will easily understand that having multiple entries, and allowing them to be optionally linked, logically means that others are not linked. Only when they are all linked will a search yield all such examinations. *Id.* It is true that when some are not linked, it may not be

possible for a search to result in all prior examinations being found. However, if it is desirable to use a search to result in all prior examinations being found, the present invention provides for a method for doing so. *Id.*

In light of the sufficient disclosure of the present application, Applicant submits that the Examiner's § 112 rejections have been overcome. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

At pages 4-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 13, 15-16, 18-19, and 23-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over a webpage by Callaway that has a URL of <http://web.archive.org/web/20011020005809/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/trade-rules.html> ("Callaway") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0050891 to Cohen ("Cohen"). Claims 11-12, 14, and 17 were also rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over Callaway in view of Cohen, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0054888 to Chester ("Chester"). Additionally, claims 20-21 were rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over Callaway in view of Cohen, and further in view of a webpage by Greenwichgolf.com ("Greenwichgolf.com") that has a URL of http://web.archive.org/web/20020605164840/greenwich_golf.com/ser02.htm.

Further, claim 22 was rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over Callaway in view of Cohen, and further in view of an article by Harreld entitled "Scrutinizing the numbers" InfoWorld, San Mateo: Aug. 19, 2002, Vol. 24, Iss. 33, pg. 35 ("Harreld"). Additionally, claims 28 and 29 were also rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over Callaway in view of Cohen, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0077956 to Solheim ("Solheim"). Finally, claim 30 was rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over Callaway, Cohen, and Solheim, in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0171927 to Bernard ("Bernard"). Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome for at least the reasons that follow.

Callaway, Cohen, Chester, Greenwichgolf.com, Harreld, and Solheim have been discussed in previous Responses filed by Applicants. For the sake of brevity, the discussion of these references in those Responses is incorporated herein, and is not repeated. As shown above, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 30 to clarify that some of the unique registration numbers that are assigned to pieces of equipment are not linked to one another, while others are linked to one another. Written Description at Page 6, lines 10-11.

Callaway, Cohen, Chester, Greenwichgolf.com, Harreld, Solheim, and Bernard, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest these features of the present invention.


In light of the amendments to independent claims 1 and 30, Applicants submit that the Examiner's § 103 rejections are moot. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the present amendments and remarks still do not resolve all of the issues regarding patentability of the pending claims, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorneys to discuss any remaining issues. No fees are believed to be due at this time. Should any fee be required, however, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-4545, Order No. 5221-043-US01.

Respectfully submitted,
Hanify & King, P.C.

Dated: November 12, 2009

By: 
Siddhesh V. Pandit, Registration No. 58,572
Hanify & King, P.C.
1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 403-2104 Telephone
(202) 429-4380 Facsimile